UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/648,606 | 08/25/2003 | Richard Harvey | 063170.6701 | 4231 |

5073 7590 02/23/2010

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
2001 ROSS AVENUE
SUITE 600
DALLAS, TX 75201-2980

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| LEWIS, ALICIA M | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2164 | |

| NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 02/23/2010 | ELECTRONIC |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomail1@bakerbotts.com
glenda.orrantia@bakerbotts.com

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/648,606 | HARVEY ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | ALICIA M. LEWIS | 2164 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 November 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-5 and 8-10* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5 and 8-10* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *10/1/09, 11/30/09, 1/20/10*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to communication filed November 30, 2009. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 8-10 are currently amended. Claims 6 and 7 are cancelled. Thus claims 1-5 and 8-10 remain pending in this application.

### *Information Disclosure Statement*

1. The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on October 1, 2009, November 30, 2009 and January 20, 2010 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statements are being considered by the examiner.

### *Claim Objections*

2. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 8-10 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 1, 2, 4 and 8-10 each recite the claim language "operable to." However "operable to" claim language suggests making an option to perform a functionality, but not actually having the system or software programmed (i.e. configured) to provide the functionality exclusively as supported by the specification. The term "configured to" indicates that at one point the system or software was set up or programmed to execute the recited steps. Thus, the claim language "operable to" should be changed to "configured to." Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gadbois et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2004/0002955 A1) ('Gadbois') in view of Hacherl et al. (US 7,200,869 B1, filing date 09/15/2000) ('Hacherl').

With respect to claim 1, Gadbois teaches a web services directory comprising:

a computer readable medium (paragraph 8); and

a processor, the processor configured to execute a program of instructions encoded on the computer-readable medium, the program of instructions comprising (paragraphs 5 and 21):

a directory module that implements a Universal Description, Discovery, and Integration (UDDI) registry (paragraphs 21 and 39) in a Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) directory (paragraphs 24 and 26), the directory module operable to:

generate at least one business entity object in the LDAP directory based on a UDDI Business Entity element(elements 232, 242, 252 in Figure 2, paragraphs 28-29);

generate at least one user object in the LDAP directory, wherein the at least one business entity object is arranged under the at least one user object in the LDAP directory (elements 222 and 224 in Figure 2, paragraphs 27 and 28);

receive a UDDI registry query (paragraphs 32 and 35); and

generate a UDDI response based on data in the at least one Business Entity object and the at least one User object in the LDAP directory (paragraphs 36, 44-46, 49 and 53).

Although Gadbois teaches that a repository stores access privileges (paragraph 24), he does not explicitly teach a user object based on an account, wherein the at least one user object comprises security information defining what objects a user has access to in a hierarchical directory, and wherein the at least one user object grants access to the user based on the security information.

Hacherl teaches a system and method for protecting domain data against unauthorized modification (see abstract), in which he teaches a user object based on an account (column 6 lines 30-30), wherein the at least one user object comprises security information defining what objects a user has access to in a hierarchical directory (column 6 lines 30-36, column 9 lines 14-39), and wherein the at least one user object grants access to the user based on the security information (column 10 lines 26-28).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Gadbois by the teaching of Hacherl because wherein the at least one user object comprises security information defining what

objects a user has access to in a hierarchical directory, and wherein the at least one user object grants access to the user based on the security information would enable secure access to shared objects and resources (Hacherl, column abstract; Gadbois, paragraph 24).

With respect to claim 2, Gadbois as modified teaches the web services directory as recited in claim 1, the directory further operable to:

generate at least one business service object (Gadbois, element 243 in Figure 2, paragraph 28); and

generate at least one binding template object (Gadbois, element 245 in Figure 2, paragraph 28), wherein the at least one business service object is arranged under the at least one business entity object, and the at least one binding template object is arranged under the at least one business service object (Gadbois, Figure 2).

With respect to claim 3, Gadbois as modified teaches the web services directory as recited in claim 1, wherein the at least one business entity object is arranged under the at least one user object by virtue of at least one corresponding user child object (Gadbois, elements 222, 232, 242 and 252 in Figure 2, paragraphs 26-28).

With respect to claim 4, Gadbois as modified teaches the web services directory as recited in claim 1, the directory module further operable to generate at least one domain object, wherein the at least one user object is arranged under the at least one

domain object (Gadbois, elements 170 and 210 in Figure 2, paragraph 24, paragraph 26, paragraph 27 lines 1-4).

With respect to claim 5, Gadbois as modified teaches the web services directory as recited in claim 1, further comprising apparatus adapted to implement the web services directory, and in which directory services are invoked (Gadbois, paragraphs 21-25).

5. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins et al. (US 2004/0204958 A1, priority date 8/30/2000) ('Perkins') in view of Martinez et al. (US 7,296,061 B2, filing date 11/21/2001) ('Martinez') and further in view of Gadbois et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2004/0002955 A1) ('Gadbois').

With respect to claim 8, Perkins teaches a web services system (abstract) comprising:

a registry in which businesses may register, the registry comprising a directory module (paragraphs 9 and 35), the directory module operable to:

generate at least one domain object (*i.e. web domain*) (paragraphs 40, 55 and 61), wherein the at least one domain object comprises a directory prefix name (paragraph 33), and the at least one domain object is a root object of the hierarchal directory (paragraph 61);

generate at least one user object (*i.e. cooperate user*) (paragraph 61), wherein the at least one user object identifies a user account for managing at least one business entity object (paragraph 63) arranged under the at least one user object (paragraphs 65-66), and the at least one user object is arranged under the at least one domain object (paragraph 61), wherein the at least one business entity object comprising at least one business name and at least one business contact (paragraphs 61 and 62), the at least one business contact comprising at least one business address (paragraphs 61 and 62);

receive a registry query (paragraph 71);

generate a response based on data in the at least one domain object and the at least one user object in the directory (paragraphs 71-73); and

a storage system for storing business information and accessible via the directory (paragraph 76).

Although Perkins teaches that users create login profiles (paragraph 65) and a user accessing objects in a hierarchical directory (paragraph 35), he does not explicitly teach wherein the at least one user object comprises security information defining what objects a user has access to in the directory, and wherein the at least one user object grants access to the user based on the security information.

Martinez teaches a distributed web services network architecture (see abstract), in which he teaches wherein the at least one user object comprises security information defining what objects a user has access to, and wherein the at least one user object

grants access to the user based on the security information (column 7 lines 44-60, column 10 lines 47-52).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Gadbois by the teaching of Martinez because wherein the at least one user object comprises security information defining what objects a user has access to, and wherein the at least one user object grants access to the user based on the security information would enable secure access to network objects and resources (Martinez, column 10 lines 47-52).

Further regarding claim 8, Perkins in view of Martinez fails to teach a directory module that implements a Universal Description, Discovery, and Integration (UDDI) registry in a Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) directory.

Gadbois teaches a registry service (see abstract), in which he teaches a directory module that implements a Universal Description, Discovery, and Integration (UDDI) registry (paragraphs 21 and 39) in a Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) directory (paragraphs 24 and 26).

It would have been obvious to a persona having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Perkins by the teaching of Gadbois because a directory module that implements a Universal Description, Discovery, and Integration (UDDI) registry in a Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) directory would enable an efficient means of recording and managing publisher assertions and relationships between businesses (Gadbois, abstract).

6. Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins et al. (US 2004/0204958 A1, priority date 8/30/2000) ('Perkins') in view of Hacherl et al. (US 7,200,869 B1, filing date 09/15/2000) ('Hacherl'), and further in view of Murto et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2004/0213409 A1) ('Murto').

With respect to claim 8, Perkins teaches a web services system (abstract) comprising:

a registry in which businesses may register, the registry comprising a directory module (paragraphs 9 and 35), the directory module operable to:

generate at least one domain object (*i.e. web domain*) (paragraphs 40, 55 and 61), wherein the at least one domain object comprises a directory prefix name (paragraph 33), and the at least one domain object is a root object of the directory (paragraph 61);

generate at least one user object (*i.e. cooperate user*) (paragraph 61), wherein the at least one user object identifies a user account for managing at least one business entity object (paragraph 63) arranged under the at least one user object (paragraphs 65-66), and the at least one user object is arranged under the at least one domain object (paragraph 61), wherein the at least one business entity object comprising at least one business name and at least one business contact (paragraphs 61 and 62), the at least one business contact comprising at least one business address (paragraphs 61 and 62);

receive a registry query (paragraph 71);

generate a response based on data in the at least one domain object and the at least one user object in the directory (paragraphs 71-73); and

a storage system for storing business information and accessible via the directory (paragraph 76).

Although Perkins teaches that users create login profiles (paragraph 65), he does not explicitly teach a Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) directory, or wherein the at least one user object comprises security information defining what objects a user has access to in the hierarchical directory, and wherein the at least one user object grants access to the user based on the security information.

Hacherl teaches a system and method for protecting domain data against unauthorized modification (see abstract), in which he teaches Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) directory (column 5 lines 10-15), wherein the at least one user object comprises security information defining what objects a user has access to in the hierarchical directory (column 6 lines 30-36, column 9 lines 14-39), and wherein the at least one user object grants access to the user based on the security information (column 10 lines 26-28).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Perkins by the teaching of Hacherl because wherein the at least one user object comprises security information defining what objects a user has access to in a hierarchical directory, and wherein the at least one

user object grants access to the user based on the security information would enable secure access to shared objects and resources (Hacherl, column abstract).

Further regarding claim 8, Perkins in view of Hacherl fails to teach a directory module that implements a Universal Description, Discovery, and Integration (UDDI) registry.

Murto teaches a service discovery access to user location (see abstract), in which he teaches a directory module that implements a Universal Description, Discovery, and Integration (UDDI) registry (paragraph 12, abstract).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Perkins by the teaching of Murto because a directory module that implements a Universal Description, Discovery, and Integration (UDDI) registry would enable a UDDI registry defined in an XML schema of hierarchical relationships to be used for describing business information service information, binding information and information about specifications and services (Murto, paragraph 59). Furthermore, the combination would enable geographically focuses UDDI search, and thus provide a user with business/service information in a region or location relating to the user's location (Murto, paragraphs 11-12).

With respect to claim 9, Perkins as modified teaches the system of claim 8, the directory module further operable to:

generate at least one business service object, wherein the at least one business service object comprises data identifying a technical service (*i.e. piano repair*), and the at least one business service object is arranged under the at least one business entity object (Perkins, Figs. 6B and 6C, paragraphs 56-57; Murto, paragraphs 53-54, 59 and 61); and

generate at least one binding template object, wherein the at least one binding template object comprises data identifying a plurality of service specifications, and the at least one binding template object is arranged under the at least one business service object (Murto, paragraphs 54-55, 59 and 62).

With respect to claim 10, Perkins as modified teaches the web services directory as recited in claim 9, the hierarchical directory module further operable to generate at least one tmodel object, wherein the at least one tmodel object comprises a keyed reference to the at least one binding template object (Murto, paragraphs 55-56, 59 and 63), and the at least one tmodel object is arranged under the at least one user object (Murto, paragraphs 53-56; Perkins, paragraphs 61-62) (*Perkins teaches that a business entity is arranged under a user object. Murto teaches that a tmodel object has a reference to the binding template object, and further that a tmodel object is arranged under a business entity.)*

### *Response to Arguments*

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 8-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

8. Applicant's arguments filed November 30, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Gadbois fails to teach a UDDI registry in a LDAP directory. Examiner disagrees. Gadbois teaches a registry service, such as a UDDI business registry (paragraph 21). He further teaches that a directory server provides a database for storing registry service information (paragraph 23), and that one such directory server that can be used is a LDAP directory (paragraphs 24 and 26). Thus, Gadbois teaches a UDDI registry in a LDAP directory.

### *Conclusion*

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALICIA M. LEWIS whose telephone number is (571)272-5599. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9 - 6:30, alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on 571-272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. M. L./
Examiner, Art Unit 2164
February 13, 2010

/Charles Rones/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2164